

REMARKS

This response is being filed in reply to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2006. In that Office Action, claims 1-5, 9-15, and 19-22 were rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 6-8 and 16-18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-5, 9-15, and 19-22 have been cancelled. Claims 23-40 have been added. Accordingly, claims 6-8, 16-18, and 23-40 are pending in the application.

Allowable Claims

Claims 6-8 and 16-18 were noted as being allowable if rewritten into independent form. Accordingly, claims 6 and 16 have been rewritten into independent form and are now allowable. Claims 7-8 and 17-18 ultimately depend from claims 6 and 16, respectively; accordingly, these claims are allowable as well.

At the conclusion of the "Allowable Subject Matter" section of the Office Action, it is stated that dependent claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 "are objectable for the same reason." However, it is believed that the Examiner intended to say that these claims "are allowable for the same reason."

New Claims

Claim 23 recites a method for operating a telematics unit on a vehicle and within a mobile vehicle communication system in which:

- (1) a primary telematics unit identifier is associated with a user account;
- (2) the primary telematics unit identifier is associated with a mobile handset;
- (3) the mobile handset is associated with a selected telematics unit operating within the mobile vehicle communication system;
- (4) the selected telematics unit is determined to be either a primary telematics unit or a secondary telematics unit; and
- (5) the selected telematics unit is operated

The primary telematics unit includes the primary telematics unit identifier and the secondary telematics unit does not include the primary telematics unit identifier.

Claim 34 recites a method for operating a telematics unit on a vehicle and within a mobile vehicle communication system in which:

- (1) a primary telematics unit identifier is associated with a user account;
- (2) the primary telematics unit identifier is associated with a mobile handset;
- (3) the mobile handset is associated with a selected telematics unit operating within the mobile vehicle communication system;
- (4) calls are routed to the mobile handset;
- (5) a determination is made of whether the call was answered at the mobile handset; and
- (6) the call is forwarded to the selected telematics unit if the call is not answered at the mobile handset.

This method is particularly useful when a mobile handset may be associated with any number of telematics units.

Claim 40 recites a method for operating a telematics unit on a vehicle and within a mobile vehicle communication system in which:

- (1) a primary telematics unit identifier is associated with a user account;
- (2) the primary telematics unit identifier is associated with a mobile handset;
- (3) the mobile handset is associated with a selected telematics unit operating within the mobile vehicle communication system;
- (4) an incoming call for the telematics unit identifier is sent to the mobile handset;
- (5) the call is forwarded to the selected telematics unit if the call is not answered at the mobile handset; and
- (6) the call is forwarded to an answering system if the call is not answered at the selected telematics unit.

This method is particularly useful for routing calls to multiple devices associated with the telematics unit identifier.

Prior Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5, 9-15, and 19-22 have been cancelled so rejection of those claims is moot. Although claims 1-5, 9-15, and 19-22 have been cancelled, the cancellation of these claims is without disclaimer of the subject matter thereof and without prejudice to Applicants' right to later pursue the subject matter of those claims in this or another application.

Claim 23 is directed to a method for operating a telematics unit on a vehicle and within a mobile vehicle communication system. The method includes, *inter alia*, the steps of associating the mobile handset with a selected telematics unit operating within the mobile vehicle communication system, and determining if the selected telematics unit is a primary telematics unit or a secondary telematics unit. The primary telematics unit includes a primary telematics unit identifier that is associated with the mobile handset and the secondary telematics unit does not include the primary telematics unit identifier. This combination of steps is not taught or suggested by Babbar, Knobl, Simonds, or the other prior art of record.

With regard to independent claims 34 and 40, the prior art of record does not disclose or render obvious the subject matter of these claims. Babbar fails to disclose routing calls to a mobile handset and forwarding the calls to a telematics unit if they are not answered at the mobile handset. Babbar does disclose a mobile station that provides a local wireless system with mobile or subscriber identification information. The local system uses the wireless network to find and inform the user's home system of the user's current mobile switching center. See paragraph [0016]. But Babbar does not disclose routing calls to the mobile handset and forwarding calls to a telematics unit if they are not answered at the mobile handset.

Likewise, Knobl fails to disclose routing calls to a mobile handset and forwarding the calls to a telematics unit if they are not answered at the mobile handset. Knobl does disclose a computer in a vehicle using a telephone as an internet link. Knobl does not route calls to the telephone, but rather, transmits SMS messages to the computer via the

telephone. Furthermore, Knobl does not disclose forwarding calls to the telephone to a telematics unit in the vehicle.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23, 34, and 40 each patentably define over the prior art. Claims 24-33 and 35-39 each ultimately depend from respective claims 23 and 34 and should be allowed therewith.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable over the prior art. Reconsideration is therefore requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if doing so would advance prosecution of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for any required fees or to credit that same deposit account with any overpayment associated with this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, P.C.

/James D. Stevens/

Date: December 26, 2006
JDS/GGB

James D. Stevens
Registration No. 35,691
P.O. Box 4390
Troy, Michigan 48099
(248) 689-3500